Conference paper

American Journal of Science Education Research

The Right Corrective Feedback in the Age of Technology: From Theory into Practice

Dr. Ahmed Samir Abdulgaffar Elsayed[*]

Assistant professor of English- School of Education
American International University

Abstract
This paper discusses the changing face of written corrective feedback (WCF) in second language writing teaching, with particular reference to the incorporation of digital technology. Based on established theoretical positions and empirical studies, the paper seeks to integrate the pedagogical repercussions of corrective feedback and illustrate how a technology-facilitated approach can enhance teaching and learning. Group discussion and classroom tasks were utilized within the associated conference presentation to promote critical thinking on the part of teachers regarding their feedback practice.

Introduction

Written corrective feedback (WCF) has long been a staple of language teaching, and in particular, second language writing development. Traditionally delivered through handwritten feedback and face-to-face interaction, feedback practices have considerably evolved with the diffusion of digital technologies in teaching and learning contexts. Such technological advancements have reconsidered the way feedback is provided, received, and understood, necessitating a re-examination of established pedagogical practices.

This article explores the meeting point of theoretical frames and new technological resources to understand the evolving profile of WCF. Specific focus is placed on integrating fundamental theories of second language acquisition with pedagogical practice to address diverse learner needs in contemporary classrooms. The article demonstrates how digital contexts not only expand the scope of feedback options but also introduce new dynamics of learner independence, interaction, and involvement. In synthesizing both the theoretical foundations and the pedagogical ramifications of WCF, this study underscores the imperative to follow an equilibrium-based, context-sensitive approach that takes advantage of the strengths of technology without dismissing the learning value of traditional methods.

Theoretical Background

Written corrective feedback (WCF) is strongly based on some of the prevailing theories in second language acquisition (SLA). One of the foundational ideas supporting WCF is the Noticing Hypothesis [1], which argues that learners must consciously notice linguistic forms and their mismatches in order to alter their interlanguage. Corrective feedback, therefore, serves as a vehicle to draw such forms to the learners' attention, augmenting fuller language processing.

Another key concept is Swain's Output Hypothesis (1985) [2], which stresses the role of language production in acquisition. Feedback received after the production of written texts by learners makes them notice gaps in their knowledge and subsequently adjust their linguistic output.

However, the role and usefulness of corrective feedback have not been free from criticism. In a highly influential paper, Truscott (1996) [3] argued against grammar correction in L2 writing classes, suggesting that it was ineffective and even damaging. He claimed that grammar correction deflects learners' attention away from communication and might lead to frustration without fostering long-term accuracy.

In contrast, scholars such as Ferris (1999) [4] and Bitchener & Ferris (2012) [5] have made the case for WCF, presenting theoretical justification as well as empirical evidence for its effectiveness. Ferris emphasized the value learners place on feedback and the positive effect it can have when it is individualized. Bitchener's research brought additional nuance to the discussion with the distinction between comprehensive and focused feedback. Targeted feedback, dealing with particular kinds of errors, was particularly useful for less proficient students, while holistic feedback was useful for more advanced students [6].

Sociocultural theory also accounts for feedback. Derived from Vygotsky's theories, this approach emphasizes the social, interactive nature of learning. Feedback is a form of scaffolding-especially in teacher-student and peer interaction-which helps learners in their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD).

Cognitive theories suggest that good feedback provokes more intense cognitive processing, especially when it prompts the learner to self-correct rather than accept teacher corrections passively. The mode, timing, and target of feedback are therefore crucial in maximizing its pedagogical usefulness.

The discussion at the theoretical level has also matured over time. Rather than debating whether feedback is effective or ineffective, the debate is now about the conditions under which different kinds of feedback are most effective, the characteristics of the learners, and the learning environment. The agreement that is emerging is that feedback must be well-timed, learner-cantered, and technologically facilitated where required.

Digital Medium and Paradigm Shift

The integration of digital technologies in feedback practice demonstrates a paradigm shift in pedagogical design. While traditional handwritten feedback offers a personal and familiar touch, digital feedback has emerged as an innovative alternative through its accessibility, timeliness, and flexibility. The introduction of computer-mediated communication tools and learning management systems (LMS) has enabled instructors to provide more readable, timely, and retrievable feedback.

During the conference talk, interactive tools such as Kahoot were utilized to invite the audience to contribute and debate the following key questions:

• Do all writing errors made by students need to be corrected?
• Who is most appropriately positioned to provide feedback: machines, peers, or teachers?
• Through what medium should feedback be most effectively provided?

These discussion-prompting reflective questions invited critical examination of shifting teacher and learner roles within digitally mediated feedback settings.

Computer-based corrective feedback has also been found to be highly effective in promoting writing accuracy, especially when it is delivered in a timely and specific manner [7]. It is a learner-autonomy supportive approach and caters to individual variations in learning styles through multimodal feedback modes. It is also responsive to the needs of digitally native learners who prefer interactive and instant communication modes. By enabling collaboration and offering scalable solutions, digital feedback tools are a part of a more responsive and inclusive writing pedagogy.

Practical Applications and Activities

Interactive activities in the conference presentation illustrated theoretical points in practical ways:

- Activity 1: Surveying participants' assumptions about error correction using Kahoot.
- Activity 2: Sorting features of traditional and digital feedback mediums.
- Group Discussions: Encouraging participants to reflect on their practice and their students' feedback preferences.

Main ideas were consolidated by mini quizzes and word-guessing games, stressing the practical advantages of digital tools:

- Legibility: More readable digital annotations compared to illegible handwriting.
- Accessibility: More convenient retrieval and storage of digital feedback.
- Timeliness: Quicker response rates via electronic media.
- Collaboration: Possibilities for peer review and online discussion.
- Support for Shy Students: Digital media can potentially elicit participation from students who hesitate to speak up in face-to-face environments.

Conclusion

Corrective feedback remains a fundamental instructional practice, but the how and wherewithal must change with an evolving learning environment. By combining theoretical insight with technological possibility, writing teachers can offer more effective, efficient, and student-friendly feedback. The shift to electronic media represents not a repudiation of traditional methodology but an extension of the variety and availability of feedback with the ultimate aim of improved student writing outcomes.

Recommendations

Written corrective feedback must be detailed and versatile in its scope. A combined methodology embracing both digital and handwritten feedback types offers clarity and ease of access without undermining the sense of personal engagement appreciated by numerous students. Proficiency-sensitive feedback tailors the level of correction to the student's proficiency level, such that beginners can receive targeted correction of frequent errors, while advanced learners are offered more extensive feedback. The use of peer and automated feedback tools has the potential to augment the feedback process, if used in a thoughtful way, to facilitate learner autonomy and reflection. These tools need to be utilized to supplement, not replace, teacher feedback. Equally important is the development of students' digital literacies so they can engage productively with various types of feedback. Corrective feedback, if used thoughtfully, then appears as a vehicle for academic progress, learner confidence, and improvement in writing over time.

References

1. Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. Applied Linguistics, 11(2), 129-158.
2. Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), Input in second language acquisition. Newbury House.
3. Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. Language Learning, 46, 327-369.
4. Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott. Journal of Second Language Writing, 8(1), 1-11.
5. Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing. Routledge.
6. Bitchener, J. (2012). A reflection on the language learning potential of written CF. Journal of Second Language Writing, 21, 348-363.
7. AbuSeileek, A. & Abu Sa'aleek, A. (2012). Computer-assisted language learning: merits and demerits. Language in India, 12(4), 23-36.
8. Dickinson, P. F. (1992, October). Feedback that works: Using the computer to respond. Paper presented at the Annual National Basic Writing Conference. College Park, MD.
9. Hadiyanto, S. (2019). The effect of computer-mediated corrective feedback on the students' writing. Language-Edu, 8(2).
10. Tummons, J. (2005). Assessing Learning in Further Education. Exeter, UK: Learning Matters Ltd.